



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEFER ARTICLES.

Primula Cusickiana Gray.—I have just received from Mr. E. M. Salt, of Boise City, Idaho, living specimens of this species collected near that place. Heretofore it has been reported only from Union county, E. Oregon, by Mr. W. E. Cusick, in whose honor the specific name was given. The "whitish line down from the sinuses" of the calyx tube is the white mealiness so common in *P. farinosa*, and is very apt to disappear in older or much handled specimens. Of course this mealiness often leaves a bleached out line which may persist or not. Mr. Salt says that the plant had been blooming since the middle of February.—J. M. COULTER.

Bentham on citation of authorities.—Referring to our editorial on the citation of authorities we were asked to give the other side of the question by reprinting some remarks by Bentham in the *Journal* of the Linnean Society, xvii (1878). p. 190. Although willing to conform to usage, we fail to see that this affects our position in the least.—EDS.

Besides the young liberal-minded botanists who scorn to submit to any rule but their own, there are others who differ materially in their interpretation of some of the laws; or who do not perceive that in following too strictly their letter instead of their spirit they are only adding needlessly to the general disorder. In the application as well as in the interpretation of these rules they do not sufficiently bear in mind two general principles: first, that the object of the Linnæan nomenclature is the ready identification of species, genera, or other groups for study or reference, not the glorification of botanists; and, secondly, that changing an established name is very different from giving a name to a new plant.

Although much credit may be due to the collector or botanist who has discovered or distinguished really new species (and it is but fair that their discovery should be commemorated), yet it is only second-rate botanists who pride themselves on the number of names, good or bad, to which their initials can be attached. In all cases, therefore, when the object is only to speak of a plant as in catalogues, references, physiological treatises, or even local floras, for practical use one can not attend too closely to the observations of DeCandolle and say *Matthiola tristis*, or *Matthiola tristis* Br., without any additions (such as *Linn.*, *sub Hesperide*), explanatory of the history of the name. Such a history, absolutely necessary in a full monograph, for instance, should always be considered as belonging to the description and history of the species, not as forming part of its name. It is also with sincere regret that we see distinguished botanists endeavoring to combine rejected with adopted names by the obviously false nomenclature exemplified in *Matthiola tristis* Linn.

There is one practice which has grown up of late years, adding largely to the number of useless synonyms, against which I can not refrain from taking this opportunity of entering a strong protest. I mean that of creating a new name in order to combine an old specific with a new generic one. In ferns, the wanton multiplication of ill-defined, or undefinable genera, according to the varied fancies of special botanists, has had the effect of placing the same species successively in several, some times seven or eight, different genera; and it is proposed to maintain for the specific appellation the right of priority, not in the genus alone in which it is placed, but in the whole of the genera to which, rightly or wrongly, it has been referred. This has been carried to such a degree as to give to the specific name a general substantive aspect, as if the generic ones were adjuncts—a serious encroachment on the beautiful simplicity of the Linnæan nomenclature; and it is to be feared that there is a tendency in that direction in phænogamic botany. When a botanist dismembers an old